UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,233	10/25/2000	Vikas Sanathana Murthy	EFIM0317	2894

31408 7590 01/07/2005

JAMES TROSINO
268 Bush Street #3434
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

EXAMINER	
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/695,233	MURTHY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 October 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *33-54* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 October 2000* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/6/01*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-32 in the reply filed on October 22, 2004, is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 25, 2000, and March 5, 2001, have been received and considered by the Examiner.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 275, 310, and 370 (see page 8). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because the text on page1, lines 2-6, should be updated with the current status of the cited applications such as: "U.S. Patent Application Serial No. & Filing Date", or "U.S. Patent No. & Issue Date". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 10, 15, 24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peacock, U.S. Patent No. 6,381,650.

3. In considering claims 1, 15, and 24, Peacock teaches a method, apparatus, and computer-readable medium for determining a valid destination address, comprising: sending an availability request to each destination address from a plurality of destination addresses, the plurality of destination addresses being correlated with a destination

party; receiving at least one response to the sent availability requests, each received response being uniquely associated with its own destination address from the plurality of destination addresses, each received response indicating one from the group of a valid destination address and an invalid destination address; and recording, for each received response, a value associated with the destination address associated with that received response, the value indicating one from the group of a valid destination address and an invalid destination address based on the received response associated with that destination address. See col. 2, lines 9-29.

4. In considering claim 10, Peacock teaches a method for determining a valid international destination address, comprising: reading a record associated with a destination party, the record having a plurality of destination addresses correlated with the destination party, each destination address having at least a network identifier and a device identifier, (col. 3, lines 59-67); sending an availability request to each destination address from the plurality of destination addresses of the record; receiving at least one response to the sent availability requests; and updating the record associated with the destination party based on each received response to the sent availability requests, (col. 2, lines 9-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 16, 17, 25, 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peacock in view of Sawyer et al. (hereinafter Sawyer), U.S. Patent No. 5,946,629 (see Applicants IDS).

3. In considering claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 16, 17, 25, and 26, although the disclosed method, apparatus, and computer-readable medium taught by Peacock shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: sending text messages.

Nevertheless, sending text messages in a network was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Sawyer teaches a method and apparatus for facilitating inter-network message communications within a telecommunications network comprising: sending text messages between the telecommunication network and other connected networks. See col. 2, lines 6-52.

Thus, given the teachings of Sawyer, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Peacock with Sawyer in order to have text messages sent to each destination address from the plurality of destination addresses. This would have enhanced the teachings of Peacock by providing a means for determining valid destination addresses (Peacock col. 3, lines 51-53) in a variety of

networks (Sawyer col. 1, lines 29-43), and communicating across the various networks utilizing the valid destination address (Peacock col. 6, lines 11-18).

4. Claims 4, 5, 13, 18, 19, 27, 28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peacock in view of the Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

5. In considering claims 4, 5, 13, 18, 19, 27, and 28, Peacock further teaches: each destination address from the plurality of destination addresses having at least a network identifier, and a device identifier, (col. 3, lines 59-67).

Although the disclosed method, apparatus, and computer-readable medium taught by Peacock shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the destination address having a carrier identifier, or gateway identifier.

Nevertheless, the AAPA teaches it was well known in the art at the time of the present invention for networks of different types to be interconnected by means of gateways (page 2, lines 1 and 2), and for carrier operators in mobile phone networks to require a carrier identifier for a destination mobile phone (page 2, lines 8-11).

Thus, given the teachings of AAPA, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Peacock with the AAPA in order to include gateway identifiers and carrier identifiers in each destination address from the plurality of destination addresses. This would have enhanced the teachings of Peacock by providing a means for determining valid destination addresses (Peacock col. 3, lines

51-53) in a variety of networks, such as mobile phone networks (AAPA page 1 line 21 through page 2 line 5), and communicating across the various networks utilizing the valid destination address (Peacock col. 6, lines 11-18).

6. Claims 6-8, 14, 20-22, 29-31,are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peacock in view of Gibbs, U.S. Patent No. 6,356,935.

7. In considering claims 6-8, 14, 20-22, and 29-31, although the disclosed method, apparatus, and computer-readable medium taught by Peacock shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: self-authentication by the destination party.

Nevertheless, self-authentication was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Gibbs teaches an improved method of self-authentication comprising: adding supplemental information to an electronic message, the supplemental information being associated with self authentication by the destination party; and sending the electronic message and the added supplemental information to at least one destination address. See col. 5, lines 23-32.

Thus, given the teachings of Gibbs, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Peacock with Gibbs in order to add supplemental information to an electronic message, the supplemental information being associated with self-authentication by the destination party; and send the electronic message and the added supplemental information to at least one destination address

having an associated received response indicating a valid destination address. This would have enhanced the teachings of Peacock by providing an efficient means for reducing unauthorized communication, Gibbs col. 2, lines 56-60.

8. Claims 9, 23, and 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peacock in view of Gibbs, and further in view of AAPA.

9. In considering claims 9, 23, and 32, Peacock further teaches: each destination address from the plurality of destination addresses having a network identifier, (col. 3, lines 59-67).

Although the disclosed method, apparatus, and computer-readable medium taught by Peacock shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: self-authentication by the destination party.

Nevertheless, self-authentication was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Gibbs teaches an improved method of self-authentication comprising: generating a plurality of codes each being uniquely associated with each destination address from a plurality of destination addresses, each code being uniquely associated with a time of being generated; receiving a self-authentication message from a destination address from the plurality of destination addresses, the self authentication message having a code value. See col. 4, line 7 through col. 6, line 6.

Thus, given the teachings of Gibbs, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Peacock with Gibbs in order to

validate a destination address from the plurality of destination addresses based on the code value of the self-authentication message corresponding to a code from the plurality of codes. This would have enhanced the teachings of Peacock by providing an efficient means for reducing unauthorized communication, Gibbs col. 2, lines 56-60.

Although the combined method taught by Peacock and Gibbs shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: the destination address having a carrier identifier.

Nevertheless, the AAPA teaches it was well known in the art at the time of the present invention for carrier operators in mobile phone networks to require a carrier identifier for a destination mobile phone (page 2, lines 8-11).

Thus, given the teachings of AAPA, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teachings of Peacock and Gibbs with the AAPA in order to include carrier identifiers in each destination address from the plurality of destination addresses. This would have enhanced the teachings of Peacock by providing a means for determining valid destination addresses (Peacock col. 3, lines 51-53) in a variety of networks, such as mobile phone networks (AAPA page 1 line 21 through page 2 line 5), and communicating across the various networks utilizing the valid destination address (Peacock col. 6, lines 11-18).

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Vaudreuil, U.S. Patent No. 6,307,931: discloses a system and method for communicating between networks having incompatible addressing formats.

Bernhart et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,493,558: teaches a gateway between a public switched telephone system and a cellular network.

Hopprich et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,792,474: discloses an apparatus and method for providing unique addresses to requesting computer systems.

Beser et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,754,622: teaches a method for determining valid and invalid network addresses.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER